

ORIGINAL

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CABN 44332)
United States Attorney

BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973)
Chief, Criminal Division

OWEN P. MARTIKAN (CSBN 177104)
Assistant United States Attorneys

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 436-7241
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234
owen.martikan@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JONATHAN HILL,

Defendant.

CR 10-0261 JSW

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER EXCLUDING TIME**

On April 7, 2010, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for arraignment on the indictment. The parties stipulated and the Court agreed that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from April 7, 2010, through April 29, 2010, for effective preparation of defense counsel. The parties represented that granting the continuance would allow the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of defense counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). The parties agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best interests of the

//

STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
CASE NO. CR 10-0261 JSW

FILED

APR 30 2010

RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1 public and the defendant in a speedy trial. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A).

2
3 SO STIPULATED:

4 JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO
5 United States Attorney

/s/

6 DATED: April 29, 2010

7 OWEN P. MARTIKAN
8 Assistant United States Attorney

/s/

9 DATED: April 29, 2010

10 DOUGLAS J. HORNGRAD
11 Attorney for Jonathan Hill

12 **[PROPOSED] ORDER**

13 As the Court found on April 7, 2010, and for the reasons stated above, an exclusion of
14 time from April 7, 2010, through April 29, 2010, is warranted because the ends of justice served
15 by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.
16 *See* 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(7)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny
17 defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the
18 exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C.
19 §3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

20
21 SO ORDERED.

22
23 DATED: 4/30/10

24 HON. BERNARD ZIMMERMAN
25 United States Magistrate Judge

26 *WANDOR VIKAS*